

Rooney

F
233/
B72R6

UC-NRLF



B 4 604 159

YD043139



BANCROFT
LIBRARY



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

Theo. W. Crook Collection

THE
MONROE DOCTRINE ASSAILED;
—OR—
ENGLAND AND VENEZUELA.

AN ADDRESS BY

MR. JOHN ROONEY
AT

EVERETT HALL,

BROOKLYN,

NEW YORK.

71⁰
107.

1891

ENGLAND AND VENEZUELA;

--OR--

THE MONROE DOCTRINE ASSAILED.

AN ADDRESS BY

MR JOHN ROONEY

--AT--

EVERETT HALL,

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

"I should have been glad to announce some disposition of the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, touching the western frontier of British Guiana, but the friendly efforts of the United States in that direction have thus far been unavailing. This Government will continue to express its concern at any appearance of foreign encroachment on territories long under the administrative control of American States. The determination of a disputed boundary is easily attainable by amicable arbitration where the rights of the respective parties rest, as here, on the historic facts, readily ascertainable."

PRESIDENT HARRISON'S MESSAGE, DECEMBER 9TH, 1891.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE STILL HOLDS.

The portion of President Harrison's message relating to the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela was an unmistakable intimation to Lord Salisbury that the Monroe doctrine still holds good. The President, after expressing his regret that the friendly efforts of the United States had failed to settle the question at issue, said: "This government will continue to express its concern at any appearance of foreign encroachment on territories long under the administrative control of American States;" and he reminded Great Britain that the determination of a disputed boundary by amicable arbitration is readily attainable, where, as in the present instance, it is easy to ascertain the historic rights of both parties. This, translated from the language of diplomacy, means that England must stop bullying Venezuela. The statesmen of the Court of St. James should take the hint.—New York Daily *Press*.

JOHN ROONEY HONORED.

THE ORDER OF BOLIVAR CONFERRED ON HIM BY VENEZUELA.

Banqueted by His Friends.

A dinner was given last Thursday evening in honor of Mr. John Rooney, of Brooklyn, on the occasion of the presentation to him of the "Order of the Liberator," by the representative of the Venezuelan Government. This distinction has been conferred on Mr. Rooney in recognition of his services in directing the attention of the American people to the invasion of Venezuelan territory by Great Britain. Covers were laid for over a hundred guests. Among those present, were : Gen. Kerwin, Hon. Napoleon Dominici, Dr. José Alfonso, Alejandro Escobar, Leoncio D'Aubeterre, Ramón Bolet, Hon. John C. McGuire, Eugene Kelly, Hon. Edward Rorke, Hon. James Rorke, Edward Rorke, Jr., Coroner Alex. Rooney, Hon. Robert A. Van Wyck, J. S. C. Judge, M. A. Power, Thomas Cassin, Hon. John A. Milholland, Hon. Arthur J. Heany, Hon. R. F. Downing, J. Curley, Miles O'Reilly, James Cassidy, John D. Carroll, Hugh King, John D. Taylor, W. M. Denman, Col. James Adair, Wm. Lyman, Daniel Walsh, P. H. Alexander, Mass.; Frank J. Morrison, Baltimore; S. Lenox Treadwell, J. J. O'Connor, Rev. D. J. Hickey, Rev. D. J. Sheehy, M. J. Dolphin, J. P. Farrell, Hon. Theophilus Olena, Felix Gallagher, John Berry, Dr. Wm. T. Carmody, Bernard Leavy, Roderick Robertson and others. The dining hall was handsomely decorated with Venezuelan, American and Irish flags. At the conclusion of the banquet Gen. M. Kerwin, who occupied the chair, said :

GEN. KERWIN'S SPEECH.

Gentlemen.—I feel a special pleasure in being present on this occasion. We are here this evening not only to manifest our friendship and esteem for a worthy citizen, but es-

pecially to express our appreciation of what the President of Venezuela has characterized in his letter to Mr. Rooney, as "services of the most signal merit performed in the cause of international justice." The honor conferred on our fellow citizen by the Venezuelan Government is bestowed only for distinguished services, rendered in the cause of right, civilization and humanity. With the character of these services doubtless most of you are familiar. Mr. Rooney has for some time past taken an active interest in placing before the American public the true status of the difficulties existing between the Republic of Venezuela and Great Britain. His action in this regard was inspired by a double motive, namely: the conservation of American interests by the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine and the prevention of the territorial spoliation of one of our sister American republics at the hands of a truculent and rapacious invader.

The significance of England's long continued encroachment on Venezuelan territory has not hitherto been duly appreciated by the American people. It is, however, to us a question of vast political and commercial importance—a question compared with which our Behring Sea or Canadian Fisheries difficulties scarce rise to the level of serious consideration. From the first, England's design has been to acquire possession of the Orinoco Delta, and thus secure the control of the entire waterways of the South American continent, and the consequent monopoly of South American trade. And this she has attempted and still attempts to accomplish, in the face of justice, right and that unwritten law promulgated by President Monroe, and reiterated in still stronger language by President Harrison in his message of this year. And it is a matter for congratulation both on the part of the citizens of the United States and of Venezuela that our Government has expressed itself so forcibly on the question of foreign encroachments on her territory. The welfare of our people, the safety of our Republic, demands that no foreign power should exercise any jurisdiction on the American Continent, save that which is now maintained under existing laws. At a time when we are reaching out for South American trade, and culti-

vating closer relations with the governments and peoples to the south of us, and constructing a waterway across the Isthmus at a vast expenditure, it would be certainly suicidal for us to permit our only commercial rival and political enemy to gain a foothold in South America, especially when such a project is accomplished by spoliation and fraud. It should rather be our purpose to use all legitimate means to expel all foreign governments from American soil, whether at the north or the south or the centre, and perfect thereby the Monroe doctrine of America for Americans.

Gen. Kerwin then presented Senor Dominici, Confidential Agent of Venezuela in New York, who said :

SEÑOR DOMINICI'S SPEECH.

“ Having been duly commissioned by the Government of Venezuela to present to Mr. John Rooney the decoration of the Order of ‘El Busto del Libertador,’ I have the honor, in the name of the Republic which is so ably presided over by the illustrious Dr. Raimundo Andueza Palacio to express to you the high esteem in which it holds the generous manifestations of Mr. Rooney regarding the present boundary question, and the attitude maintained by the Venezuelan Government against the odious encroachments of Great Britain on Venezuelan territory. Already she holds a large portion of our territory, and brutally attempts to retain it, in flagrant violation of the principles of justice, and despite her own promises, which she so solemnly made. The whole nation of Venezuela greatly appreciates your sympathetic and magnanimous efforts, and appeals to the generosity of this great sister Republic, which is as noble as it is powerful, for its sympathies and invaluable support.”

Mr. Dominici then invested Mr. Rooney with the Order amid tumultuous applause. The decoration is very beautiful, and consists of two large badges, one gold and the other silver. The gold badge is attached to a ribbon of the Venezuelan colors, which is worn round the neck in the place of a tie, the badge showing in front. The silver badge is worn on the left breast, and with it is a button of the Venezuelan Legion of Honor, which is worn like our Grand Army button.

When the applause subsided, Mr. Rooney said :

MR. ROONEY'S ADDRESS.

The high honor that has been conferred on me by the Government of Venezuela is of such a delicate character that I feel embarrassed to know in what words I may express my acknowledgment of it.

I observe that the medals of gold and silver are those pertaining to the Order of that illustrious patriot and soldier, General Simon Bolivar, the founder of five of the Republics of South America, a man whose name will go down the annals of history, and form a part of that grand galaxy of noble and illustrious men, whose lives and fortunes have been consecrated to the cause of civilization and human liberty. And while I appreciate the honor of having my name distinguished by the Order of the Liberator, yet it will ever be my proud distinction to remember that the Government which he founded has not deemed me unworthy of becoming a member of the Society which was organized and established to perpetuate his name and glorious deeds.

This decoration, so essentially different from the meaningless baubles conferred by monarchies and despotisms, I, as an American citizen, can freely and proudly accept, representing and symbolizing as it does the principles of Republicanism and National liberty ; and, further, coming as it does from the Government of a sister Republic with which I have never been associated, and which I never had the pleasure of visiting, it is clearly devoid of any suspicion of self-interest of either donor or recipient ; and, therefore, it will be the more prized by me, and it will consequently ever remain an honored heirloom in my family.

Gentlemen : I do not regret, but rather feel proud, if I have been the instrument of calling the attention of even a portion of the people of this great Republic to the threatened spoilation of the territory of our sister Republic of Venezuela by that universally acknowledged invader of the rights of weak and defenceless nations—England. And I make bold to state that should she ever attempt to enforce her pretended claims to one inch of the s-called disputed territory north of

the Esequibo River, she would raise a storm that would shatter her power from the circumference to the centre.

The bully and the invader are characters that are despised by the entire American people, whether those characters appear in the person of the individual or the nation; and the day for such to interfere with impunity in questions of national or international importance, or in the internal affairs of the Republics of this hemisphere is passed.

England entered upon the territory of Venezuela in direct violation of existing treaties and kept encroaching thereon until the gold mines of Caratal were discovered in 1858, since which time she took possession of the territory mentioned as a highwayman would of the property of his victim: and when Venezuela protested England resorted to her old time policy of playing the bully and threatening to bombard her seacoast cities if Venezuela dared to dispute her right to the possession of this property.

The Government and people of Venezuela relying on the justice of their cause and true to their past record for patriotism and bravery refused to be either bullied or cajoled into a compliance with England's unjust demands; and they still so refuse and I mistake the American character if it ever would permit England to carry out her threat of retaining possession of this vast and valuable property, including the Orinoco River—the Dardanelles of the Southern Continent—thereby giving her absolute control of the entire internal waterways of South America; and I say without fear of contradiction that no Administration, be it either Republican or Democratic would ever permit the consummation of such an international outrage on a sister republic. Any attempt on the part of England to retain this stolen territory would arouse the American people to such a degree that before they resumed their avocations they would completely wipe out every vestige of British power from this continent.

It is my fond wish to see the two great continents of North and South America at no distant day united in an alliance, offensive and defensive, to protect the rights of each in a grand brotherhood of prosperous republics whose governments will consist of their respective citizens, peaceably managing their own affairs without the need of vast bodies of

armed men, kept in idleness, for the subjection and suppression of every generous and human instinct.

Mr. Dominici: I hope you will accept on behalf of your Government the assurance of my profound gratitude for this token of confidence and esteem from the Government of Venezuela of which you are the bearer: and, in such fitting language as you may deem best to use, convey to your illustrious President and his Cabinet my heartfelt thanks for, and high appreciation of this distinguished honor.

The Chairman next proposed the toast, "The President of the United States," which was responded to by Mr. W. M. Denman of New York as follows:

MR. DENMAN'S SPEECH.

I am glad that the toast which has been assigned to me is one that furnishes a subject at once congenial as well as replete with patriotic inspiration. It is said that we ought to estimate a population not by the worst specimens, but rather by the best it contains, and accordingly if we may regard the United States by the standard of its first citizen we have great reason to congratulate ourselves as being the most intelligent, the most virtuous and the most progressive country in the world. Benjamin Harrison stands to-day before the world as a man who by universal acknowledgment is the fitting occupant of the highest position in the gift of the nation, and in the years wherein he has so worthily filled the office of Chief Magistrate the wisdom of his views, the dignity of his conduct and the gracious utterances of his lips have disarmed his political opponents and transformed them into enforced admirers. Let the tongue of scandal assail him and none are quicker than his partisan adversaries to rise up in his defense and demand fair play and proper respect. Although this festive occasion is not the opportune time to dwell in detail upon the events which have conferred so great a lustre upon his administration, it is right and proper to say that with an exceptionally able Cabinet of eminent advisers, the names of some of whom and without disparagement to the others, that of James G. Blaine particularly, excite and inspire sentiments of the purest patriotism, the government of this great

people has never been more ably conducted, nor the proud aspiration of our citizens of America for Americans been more manfully vindicated and realized.

The snobbishness that flourishes in the smiles of foreign aristocrats, and loves, obsequiously, to imitate the manners and habits of aliens, has received a wholesome check, and we have at last come to realize that this nation has an arm to enforce as well as a tongue to plead for right and justice; and that to be a citizen of the United States of America is as proud a distinction as that conferred by Rome in the ancient days, when to be a Roman was greater than a king.

Our thoughts are particularly directed this evening to our sister Republic of Venezuela whose representative is here present to place a deserved compliment in the hands of our friend John Rooney, and it is to me a very great satisfaction to know that his efforts in behalf of that Republic in opposing the forcible and wrongful aggression of a foreign power are all in the line of the bold and unmistakable tone and temper of the utterances and declarations of the President.

Long life to President Harrison and his Cabinet. May the record of their achievements be the inspiration and pride of our future historian.

Mr. John J. Rogers, the well-known Brooklyn lawyer, spoke to the toast of "The South American Republics." The response to this toast had been assigned to Señor Vicente Mayrez, but that gentleman was unavoidably absent. Mr. Rogers said :

It is, I assure you, a source of much pleasure to me, as an American, to observe the interest and fraternal feeling on the part of the Government and the people of the United States toward the South American Governments and peoples that have lately been exhibited, and to see the barriers of indifference to their mutual interests removed, that have so long existed only for the benefit of foreign nations, alien to us in government, in feeling, and in interests.

It would, of course, be impossible for me to convey to you in a few moments talk, in any adequate way, the manifold reasons for a closer commercial union between the peoples of this hemisphere, and the advantages that all would derive from such a *reapproachment*.

It is a matter of regret that hitherto the people of the United States and those of the South American Republics have remained in such ignorance of one another. True, the peoples of the Southern Continent have always been ardent admirers of this great and generous and liberty loving Republic of the North, and we have always manifested a friendly interest in their destinies, from the time when President Monroe proclaimed his immortal doctrine, warning all foreign Governments to keep their hands off South American Republics to the present day, when President Harrison, as we see by his recent message, exercised the good offices of his administration, to avert the threatened revolution in Brazil.

An erroneous impression has hitherto prevailed—a sentiment sedulously propagated and confidently believed—that the people of South America were turbulent and revolutionary, and were not educated up to the level of constitutional government. How easily the South Americans could show the absurdity of that allegation. They could point to the sacrifices of blood and treasure that they made in establishing their independence; they could point to the incomparable achievements of Simon Bolivar, the liberator of five Republics: they could show that less blood has been shed in South American revolutions so called, since they threw off the yoke of Spain, than has been shed in any one of the numerous wars that has taken place in enlightened Europe during the present century. They might even advert to the fact that while it cost us people of the United States 800,000 lives and six thousand millions of money to free our slaves a quarter of a century ago, the people of the United States of Brazil within the last two years, freed their slaves—1,500,000 in number—and changed from a monarchy to a republic without angry collision, and passed through two bloodless revolutions. Can any higher testimony be adduced to the civilization and developement of the South Americans? The colonization of the North and South American continents was accomplished under salienily different conditions; and if a rigid comparison of results were instituted, I confidently believe that South America would not suffer by the comparison. Here in the North American continent, for instance, the aboriginal races

were exterminated, as so-called civilization sounded its onward march. But wherever the Spaniards settled the native races were spared ; the invaders intermingled and intermarried with them, and there they are to-day in their millions, from the Rio Grande to the Straits of Magellan, to attest the humanity of the Spanish invaders. Why do I mention those things ? To give you one instance out of many why the South Americans should not be measured by the standard of other peoples. In elevating the native races, their own was in a degree dragged down, and this largely accounts for the apparent turbulence of the South American populations in their political progress.

I hope that the auspicious movement for a closer union and understanding of our peoples in this hemisphere will continue. South America possesses all the bounties of nature, the sources of untold wealth, a soil bursting with precious minerals, a Republican form of Government from the centre to the sea, a progressive and ambitious population ; and it should be the ardent desire of all the peoples from the St. Lawrence to Cape Horn that those independent peoples should be united in a moral, political, and commercial solidarity, and advance hand in hand to the accomplishment of a common and glorious destiny.

MR. M. D. GALLAGHER

who responded to the toast "The United States," delivered an admirable address. His happy references to, and elucidation of, the educational facilities presented in this country as contrasted with the lack of opportunities for mental advancement in Europe, were timely and well told. "The Monroe Doctrine" and its application, as between Venezuela and British encroachments, received especial allusion and justification. Mr. Gallagher closed his remarks, complimenting the honored guest of the evening, Mr. Rooney, and dwelt at considerable length upon his well known love for and services to the brave little Republic of Venezuela.

Mr. R. F. Downing, head of the customs brokerage and

forwarding firm of R. F. Downing & Co., of New York, then responded to the toast: "Our Commercial Relations with Venezuela," Mr. Downing said:

MR. DOWNING'S SPEECH.

A friend at my left has just remarked in a joking mood "We are the people!" I Believe he is right, not only in the joking sense, but in the full acceptance of the phrase. We American people *are* the people; no North, no South, but all America bound together in one love of our country, with hands extended to each other and hearts beating together. Here we have only the warmest feelings for our Southern sister republics and, while the same feelings will, we hope, be extended to us still it has happened that in one place we felt a little "Chili," Venezuela has shown her feelings in a marked manner by honoring one of our distinguished citizens in a way that is international and most pleasing to us all.

We congratulate the happy recipients, John Rooney. Some little while ago, while in a foreign country, I was told that we may have the friendship of America so long as Europe has her trade. To exemplify, I was told the story of a mosquito and an Irishman

"Ye say that everything was made by Providence for a purpose. Now what on airth was a mosquito made for?"

"Oh, that's quite plain," was the answer. "Mosquitos were made to destroy the germs of malaria."

"Malaria, is it? Destroy the germ, eh! well"—after deep consideration—"Well, why don't the baste attend to his business?"

That is exactly our position. We are friendly to the South American Republics; we want closer trade relations with that grand continent. If so—why on earth don't we attend to our business?

When we really go to work on this subject we can get our share of this vast trade. Then we can illustrate the story told me by a darkey up in Westchester County along the Sound. This old fellow went out to fish. He put a minnow ne the hook and threw the line in. Then he remembered

that he had to go off and take a 'Nip.' When he came back there was a big fish on the hook. 'Little fish catch big fish; big fish catch bigger fish,' mused Sam. So he left the big fish on the hook, threw it over and went off for another 'nip.' A 'friend' of Sam's came along, saw the line, pulled it up, and taking off the big fish put on a little fellow and threw in the line again. Sam came back and braced himself to pull up a big one. Up came a minnow.

'My Lord,' said Sam, with bulging eyes: 'My Lord, how he am shrunk!'

So it will be, gentlemen, with the European trade with South America when we get to working together. When the European fishermen pull up their trade fish in the near future, they will exclaim, with bulging eyes, "Lord, how it am shrunk!"

The total value of the imports from Venezuela to the United States for the year ending June 30th, 1890, was \$10,966,765, of which all but \$5,995 was entered free of duty.

The total exports from the United States to Venezuela during the same period were \$3,984,280.

This leaves an excess of imports over exports of \$6,982,485.

In other words, even under present conditions and without the needed stimulus of mutual treaties, and closer commercial friendship the United States is losing nearly seven millions of dollars' worth of trade that naturally belongs to her, which is being taken by outside rivals. Not only, therefore, should we secure this enormous trade of seven millions of dollars, which should be ours as return cargo, but there is but little doubt that vigorous action would very greatly enlarge this volume.

A few words showing the great natural resources of Venezuela may be interesting. Agriculture leads all other branches of industry, and chiefly embraces the cultivation of cocoa, sugar cane and coffee, coffee being the greatest source of national wealth. It may be safely said that the soil of Venezuela ranks among the most fertile of the South American Continent, producing all kinds of grain, cotton, tobacco, and every kind of fruit native to tropical climates. The immense plains of the Republic covered with nutritious grasses, sup-

ported as far back as three years ago 8,476,891 head of cattle thus giving the basis of a great export trade in hides. This interest is growing constantly.

Throughout the Venezuelan territory are many mines of precious metal, including gold, silver, copper, coal, asphalt, tin, lead, petroleum Kaolin, Iron, and phosphates.

The precious woods, timber and dye woods, are found in many parts of the State and need only active development, and increased foreign demand to be a source of great wealth. For example in the National Exhibition of 1883 samples of six hundred different kinds of native wood suitable for cabinet work, and carpentry were displayed. These woods comprise both the richest and most useful varieties. Medicinal plants and substances of all kinds including Peruvian Bark abound.

Another source of national wealth are the salt mines which were discovered in the 15th century by the Spaniards. These mines are operated however under Government directions.

Without going into all the details of the Venezuelan resources, which embrace the hardy products of our Northern climes, with the growths of the tropics, it will be seen that our Southern Sister has within herself the elements of great wealth and progress, and that our own interests, if we confine ourselves alone to business motives, would dictate a closer union on commercial lines.

As may be seen by the inspection of the maps the chief port of entry La Guaira situated in the Northern part of the State of Miranda is the most ideal commercial inlet to the country being in direct communication by cable and five or six line of steamers with the United States, and the various countries of Europe, and as a matter of geographical position Venezuela is the most accessible of South American countries.

FROM "THE NEW YORK TABLET,"

December 12, 1891.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE SUSTAINED.

One of the most significant utterances in President Harrison's Message is the allusion to the encroachment of England on Venezuelan territory, in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. It is the most unequivocal and direct assertion of that doctrine that has been made by any President since that principle was first promulgated. President Harrison's position in relation to this question will receive the undivided support of the American people. The history of the gradual invasion of Venezuelan territory, sometimes by stealth, and at other times by the methods of the burglar and the bully, during the past forty years, is well known to our readers. The attempt of England to seize the Orinoco Delta, and thereby possess herself of the internal waterways of the South American Continent, has been carried on with a persistency and cunning peculiarly her own. While posing as an advocate of the principle of arbitration, she defiantly rejects that principle in her dealings with weak States. She submitted the Afghanistan boundary difficulty with Russia to arbitration recently, but bullied Portugal out of her African possessions ; and she to-day agrees to settle her Behring Sea claims as against the United States by a commission of arbitration, while refusing to accept the same method for the determination of her difficulty with Venezuela.

The Gladstone administration had promised to settle the question by arbitration, but Lord Salisbury on assuming power, repudiated, in violation of all precedent and of his own declarations, the act of his predecessors. He refused the good offices of Spain and of the United States to bring the long-standing difficulty to an amicable settlement.

President Harrison's statement of the attitude of this Government on the question cannot fail to have a wholesome effect. "This Government will continue to express its concern at any appearance of foreign encroachment on territories long under the administrative control of American States."

This meaning is as plain as diplomatic language will allow. And that there is no adequate reason for continuing the dispute the President makes equally plain. "The determination of a disputed boundary is easily attainable by amicable arbitration, where the rights of the respective parties rest, as here, on historic facts, readily ascertainable." In thus re-asserting the Monroe Doctrine the President will receive the united support of the whole American people. Instead of allowing England to acquire new footholds at this side of the Atlantic, it should rather be the purpose of Americans to weaken the power she already possesses here, and to promote and sustain the doctrine of America for the Americans, whether at the north or the south or the centre.

From "THE NEW YORK WORLD," December 27, 1891.

MR. ROONEY'S NEW MEDALS.

WHY HE WAS GIVEN A TOKEN OF A FOREIGN
NATION'S GRATITUDE.

*DECORATED WITH "THE ORDER OF THE LIBERATOR"
OF VENEZUELA.*

A BROOKLYN CITIZEN WHO HAS LONG BEEN PROMINENT IN
IRISH AND AMERICAN POLITICAL MOVEMENTS DELIVERED
AN ADDRESS UPON ENGLAND'S ENCROACHMENTS UPON
VENEZUELA, WHICH THE LATTER COUNTRY
FULLY APPRECIATED.

A Brooklyn man is the latest acquisition to the ranks of American citizens who have been honored with decorations from foreign governments. He is John Rooney, and he is well known in connection with political movements as well as with Irish agitation on this side of the Atlantic. The distinction conferred upon him recently is that of a decoration of "The Order of the Liberator" of Venezuela.

The personality of the man thus honored by a sister republic is a many sided one. Those who only know Mr. Rooney—for he disclaims any right to the title of Judge—by his political record have but a poor idea of the man, owing to the fact that he has been a sort of political free lance ; more than a few have got the impression that he was a political adventurer of that type which is commonly identified with “independent” movements. So far, however, from making politics a profession he has made it a side issue, for he is a man of means and he has never held office.

Physically Mr. Rooney is rather above the medium height, compactly built and with a military bearing. He is in his fifty-fifth year, but he does not look it, as there is no trace of silver in the almost Titian and luxuriant growth of hair, or in his imperial whiskers or shaggy eyebrows. The fact that he is an ardent advocate of Ireland's cause, and an equally tireless agitator against British encroachment, was the prime cause of his winning Venezuela's esteem. His attention was called by a commissioner of the latter's Government to the attempts upon the part of England to annex to British Guiana a large slice of Venezuelan territory, and of the futile attempts made during a period of many years to have the question of boundary lines settled by arbitration.

As an American citizen, Mr. Rooney became more interested inasmuch as England's action was in direct opposition to the Monroe Doctrine. He promised to look carefully into the matter and to do what he could to interest the United States in a subject that had an important bearing upon this nation's commerce. He subsequently delivered an address, wherein he set forth the facts of the case at a meeting of the King's County Protective League, held at Everett Hall on January 29th last. The address attracted attention, and in recognition of the services rendered, the Venezuelan Government decorated Mr. Rooney with “The Order of the Liberator.”

The order is so called in commemoration of Simon Bolivar, whom every schoolboy knows as the South American Washington. It is somewhat similar to the Legion of Honor, of France. The decoration can only be conferred upon those

who have done some signal service for the country, and with the combined approval of Congress and the President. The emblem is in two pieces. Of these, the larger is of gold in the form of a sunburst, about three and a half inches in circumference. In the centre is a miniature of Bolivar. The smaller piece is engraved with the coat-of-arms of Venezuela. Delmonico's was the scene of the formal presentation, which occurred at a dinner given less than a fortnight since. A number of well-known men were among the guests.

On receiving the decoration Mr. Rooney made a speech. Among other things he said :

“ This decoration, so essentially different from the meaningless baubles conferred by monarchies and despotisms, I, as an American citizen, can freely and proudly accept, representing and symbolizing as it does the principles of Republicanism and National liberty ; and, further, coming from the Government of a sister Republic with which I have been associated, but never had the pleasure of visiting, is clearly devoid of any suspicion of self-interest of either donor or recipient, and, therefore, the more to be prized by me, and it will consequently ever remain an honored heirloom in my family.

“ The bully and invader are characters that are despised by the American people, whether those characteristics appear in the person of the individual or nation. England entered upon the territory of Venezuela in direct violation of existing treaties, and kept encroaching thereon until the gold mines of Carotol were discovered in 1858, at which time she took possession of this place and valuable property, as a highway-man would take possession of his victim, and when Venezuela rebelled, England resorted to the old-time policy of the bully, and threatened to bombard the seacoast cities of Venezuela if she dared to question her right to the possession of this property. The Government of Venezuela, relying on the justice of the cause, and true to its past record for patriotism and bravery, refused to be either bullied or cajoled into a compliance with England's unjust demand, and she still so refuses.”

Mr. Rooney has a handsome residence at No. 59 St. John's

Place on Prospect Heights, while his office is at No. 145 Broadway, New York. He was born in County Monaghan, Ireland, in 1837, and when only eleven years old participated in the rebellion of 1848 by carrying pikeheads from the blacksmith shop to the depot. He came to America when a boy, and proceeded to carve out his own destiny without delay. After trying his hand at several callings, he began the study of law under Frederick A. Lane, through whom he became identified with some large financial enterprises. His success in this line has kept him in it up to the present time. He is now an officer of several large corporations. For some time he was connected with Gen. Butler, a large photograph of whom looks down upon his desk.

In Land League matters Mr. Rooney occupied a prominent place, and he was a chief organizer of the Irish-American Blaine movement in 1884, although originally he was a Democrat. During the last campaign he was one of the founders of the Protectionist organization of which the King's County Protective League, whose President he now is, is the successor.

NEW YORK TRIBUNE, Friday, December 18, 1891.

A DINNER TO JOHN ROONEY.

DECORATED WITH THE VENEZUELAN ORDER OF THE LIBERATOR.

Some time ago John Rooney, the well-known Irish Republican of Brooklyn, called the attention of the Government to the efforts that England was making to obtain possession of the Orinoco Delta, and thereby secure control of the internal waterways of South America. In recognition of his services in the matter, the Venezuelan Government bestowed upon Mr. Rooney the "Order of the Liberator." This decoration was presented by a special representative of the South American Republic last night at a dinner at Delmonico's, given in honor of the recipient and in recognition of the affair by the numerous friends of Mr. Rooney.

General Kerwin, Collector of Internal Revenue, presided. Covers were laid for 100 guests and there were few vacant seats. The dining-hall was tastefully decorated with American, Venezuelan and Irish flags. Mr. Rooney sat the right of the chairman. General Napoleon Dominici sat at the left. The others at the speakers' table were Dr. Jose Alfonse, Dr. Pedro Vicente Myarez, the Rev. Dr. D. J. Sheehy, Edward Rorke, the Rev. D. J. Hickey, General Nicanor Bolet Peraza, Bernard Biglin, Deputy Collector Gunner, Supervising-Inspector Milholland, ex-Justice Maurice J. Power, Judge Van Wyck, John McConvil, J. P. Farrell, Major E. J. O'Shaughnessy, J. W. O'Brien, Dr. Luis Rodrigues, R. F. Downing, Dr. C. J. MacGuire, C. W. Anderson, Thomas Lenane, Hugh King, J. C. McGuire, of Brooklyn; General D. F. Burke, A. J. Heaney, Captain Alexander Watts and Bernard Leavey.

In his opening address General Kerwin touched upon the international significance of the celebration. He quoted the language of the President of the Venezuelan Republic, who characterized what Mr. Rooney had done as "services of the most signal merit performed in the cause of international justice." He pointed out the political and commercial importance of the question, and complimented the present Administration for the unequivocal stand it had taken in relation to the affair, and declared that the American people were all of one mind when it was a question of maintaining the Monroe Doctrine.

General Kerwin then presented Senor Dominici, who invested Mr. Rooney with the order amid tumultuous applause. The decoration is very beautiful, and consists of two large badges, one gold and the other silver. The gold badge is attached to a ribbon of the Venezuelan colors, which is worn around the neck in place of a tie: the silver badge is worn on the left breast. Secretary Blaine's name was loudly cheered during one of the speeches that followed. Among the toasts were: "The President of the United States," "Our Sister Republic," "The United States" and "Our Commercial Relations with Venezuela." W. M. Denman, M. D. Gallagher, and R. F. Downing were among the principal speakers.





THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS WAS DELIVERED AT

EVERETT HALL,

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK,

—BY—

MR. JOHN ROONEY.

apropos of the present invasion of Venezuelan Territory by the British Guainan authorities. Several prominent Venezuelan gentlemen occupied seats on the platform.

The Venezuelan Government has again called the attention of the United States Government to the high-handed and outrageous proceedings of the British Government in its attempted annexation of one-seventh of the territory of the Republic of Venezuela. Great Britain has been for a number of years steadily encroaching on Venezuelan territory heedless of the protests of the Venezuelan Government. The robbery has been perpetrated while England and the Republic are at peace. British laws are established in Venezuelan territory; British men-of-war patrol the rivers to guard the invaders; the rich mines and timber lands are in their possession, and the British are reaping a rich harvest, despite the remonstrances of the Venezuelan Government. The British set the protest of their weak neighbors at defiance and steadily clutch more territory. Their method is to push into and colonize Venezuelan lands, and then to claim them as British territory. As the Venezuelans are weak, England tries to terrorize them into compliance with her demands, and awe them into submission by threatening them with her vast military armaments. She has already pushed her way beyond the Schomberg demarkation line—a line not only unauthorized by either of the respective Governments, but rejected by the one and repudiated by the other. The Venezuelan Government, unable to resist the march of British power, has repeatedly offered, while protesting against the outrage, to submit the question to arbitration. But Great Britain refuses to acquiesce in the proposal. She only recognizes the principle of arbitration when dealing with great powers. The other day she bullied Portugal in Africa, although the Portuguese were willing and anxious to

submit their rights as against British claims to arbitration. She is more willing to submit the Behring Sea question to arbitration, after some characteristic bluster and a crude attempt to outwit Secretary Blaine. In short, Great Britain is willing to submit to arbitration, where she is sure to lose in any event, as when dealing with America, Russia, Germany, France, or some other strong customer of the sort, but where she is strong enough to crush the weak beneath her iron heel, she recognizes no law but that of force. She will meet America at a Geneva conference; she will come to terms with Russia at a Berlin conference; but where the rights of a weak nation are involved, the only principle of settlement she admits is the arbitrament of the sword. This is the case in the present Venezuelan question.

That does not, however, relieve the United States Government from taking action in the matter. It cannot be indifferent to the situation without ignoring the "Monroe Doctrine," and sacrificing American interests. The object of the British Government from the beginning of this affair has been to obtain possession of the Orinoco River, which by its tributaries connects with the Amazon, and through the latter gives access to all South America. This is the key to Great Britain's action in relation to Venezuela for the past half century. When the Venezuelan Government and press appeal to the United States to defend their territorial integrity, we are met with an outburst of protestation on the part of the British press and the "Foreign Office" is threatened on us if we should make any move in the matter. The British journals declare that any interference of ours in the affair would involve an extension of the "Monroe Doctrine." We can see nothing in the action of the United States in ordering all foreign nations to keep their hands off all states on this hemisphere, and nothing in the so-called "Monroe Doctrine" in the least inconsistent with European diplomacy. Every country holds that there are certain territorial questions, in which, though the territory involved lies outside of its own immediate dominion, it has a peculiar and exceptional interest. Germany has repeatedly declared this about the fate of Trieste and Constantinople. England

declares it always about Egypt and the whole group of territories that abut in any manner, however remote, upon the shortest sea-route to India. Lord Granville, a few years ago, when Minister of Foreign Affairs, protested against a protectorate over Tripoli on that avowed principle, and Lord Salisbury did likewise a short time ago. The French Government is at this moment guarding by armed force its exceptional rights in north Africa, where it owns nominally only one province. The Government of the United States, in precisely the same way, declares that political events on the American continents have for it a special and separate interest. This is all it says, and the importance of the saying is in no way increased by the habit of calling its intimation a "doctrine" and attaching a President's name. The United States Government has recently served notice to all whom it may concern that it intends to uphold this doctrine, by its action in relation to the Samoan Island's difficulty, and by Secretary Blaine's invitation to the Hawaiian Government to attend the conference of American nations at Washington. Nobody questions that Germany is deeply interested in Trieste, France in north Africa, and Great Britain in the route to India, and America is entitled to make a similar claim touching these western continents. Nobody is bound by it any more than any one is bound by the British, German, or French: they are only informed of a possible danger of resistance under certain contingencies, and it is well to be so informed. If France resolves to threaten Egypt, or Italy to menace Trieste, the German or British doctrine on the subject will be taken into as serious account as if it had been newly formulated in a dispatch *ad hoc*, no more and no less.

If a European power has a grievance against Chili, or Columbia, or Mexico, or Venezuela, it will first consider whether it is worth while to risk American displeasure, as it would consider in a European quarrel the displeasure of a great power.

The following historical resumé will make the matter in question plain to all.

It is a somewhat lengthy story, and will require a glance at the past history of the Spanish Dominions in America to make it clear to the reader.

The Republic of Venezuela inherited its territorial rights

by a treaty of recognition signed by Spain, March 30, 1845. The Province of Guiana was a part of this territory, and its boundaries were the Atlantic Ocean on the east, and the Amazon River on the south. Spain ceded part of this territory, by which its boundaries were changed.

During the war with the Dutch in which the latter seized part of Guayana, Spain ceded the part held by the treaty of Munster, January 30, 1648. Although the Dutch possessions were not specified in the treaty, they were named in the extradition treaty of Aranjue, June 23, 1791, and embraced the colonies of San Eustaquio, Curacoa, Esequibo, Demerara, Berbice and Surinam. By the treaty of London, August 13, 1814, the Dutch ceded to Great Britain, Esequibo, Demerara, and Berbice. Hence these are the sole rights possessed by Great Britain in Guiana, the rights ceded by Holland. If Holland had no rights to other possessions, no such right is now possessed by Great Britain. In this connection it is worthy to remark, that, although the Dutch tried to violate this treaty, which prohibited them from navigating and bartering in the Spanish provinces they were repulsed by force of arms by the Spaniards. The Dutch did not even pretend to be the owners of lands beyond the Esequibo on the north side, and nothing was said in relation to such claim in the transfer made to Great Britain.

It is evident then that in 1810 the Esequibo was recognized as the southern boundary limit of Venezuelan territory. In 1819 the Republic of Columbia, embracing New Granada, Venezuela, and Ecuador, was declared independent. In 1821 a congress was convened, and a constitution adopted for the new republic in which it was incorporated that the Esequibo was the limit between the Republic of Venezuela and Dutch Guiana. In 1829, the three states separated amicably, and a new constitution was adopted by Venezuela, and the Esequibo was maintained as the boundary line. In 1840, Mr. Schomberg, an engineer, was sent by the British Government to make a survey regarding the demarkation line, and without any reason or pretext, he established posts and other marks as far as Barima and Amacuro. The Venezuelan Government protested, and the English Government in con-

sequence ordered the removal of the posts and marks, explaining that they were not placed there as signs of ownership.

Since then Venezuela has vainly been trying to make a treaty to settle the boundary question. The English Government has meantime pursued its traditional policy with weak States where boundaries are in dispute, namely, that of keeping the question open and continually encroaching on the disputed territory. In 1842, the Government of Venezuela sent to London Dr. Alexander Fortique, who obtained the results above referred to. It also sent to Demerara as commissioners, Messrs. José S. Rodríguez and Juan José Romero to learn the details of the explorations and surveys, to maintain the rights of Venezuela, to investigate the origin and reasons of the Amacuro affair, to give the English authorities all necessary explanations concerning the true limits of Venezuela and English Guiana, to protest against the violation of Venezuelan territory and to demand the removal of the marks, flags, etc., placed in the mouth of the Amacuro and Barima Rivers and everywhere else, and to agree concerning the limits, if the Governor of Demerara was willing to do so. The latter replied he had no authority to make any treaty touching the boundary question, which he thought should be discussed with the British Government. As to the marks, he answered that they were placed by Mr. Schomberg, by the request of Lord John Russell, who, at the solicitation of Lord Palmerston had asked him, the Governor, to agree with the engineer in regard to the limits. And he added curiously, that the work of the engineer was not an act of appropriation but a mark of presupposed limits. At this time the Venezuelan Minister in London proposed a treaty which was not considered till 1844, fixing the Esequibo as the boundary, and basing his claims on history, conventional rights, and the authority of geographical charts. Lord Aberdeen, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, proposed the Moroco River, and stated that with this boundary Venezuela had the free title to the Orinoco River. But Venezuela refused to accept a boundary which deprived her of the land between the Esequibo and Moroco Rivers : to which England had no title. In 1836, Mr.

Kerr Porter, Charge d'Affairs of the British Government, on account of the loss of the brigs *Coriolanus* and *Sir Walter Scott*, loaded with cattle, bound for Trinidad, the last named vessel having gone ashore for want of pilots, when sailing from Caugrejos to Barima Point, asked as a favor from Venezuela to erect a lighthouse at Barima Point, stating that without it, it was impossible to obtain any marine insurance. Even Lloyd's in London had refused to take risks, except at the highest rates, and sometimes refused at any figure. This concession, made in the interests of commerce and for the benefit of humanity in general, was the only one ever granted by Venezuela, or claimed by England. Venezuela never thought that her titles were disputed to the lands further north of the mouth of the Pomaron River, but of those between that river and the Esequibo. This may be easily seen from the proposition of Lord Aberdeen, who was satisfied with the mouth of the Moroco River as the western limit of British Guiana. Even if admitting for argument, that the lands in dispute were greater in extent, Great Britain has no right to occupy them, for she contracted such an obligation by the convention of November, 1850, through Sir Bedford Clinton Wilson, British Charge d' Affairs. This convention was held at the request of the British Minister, and with instructions from the British Government. The British representative declared that Great Britain would not occupy nor usurp the territory in question, and he obtained similar declarations from Venezuela, yet Great Britain has flagrantly violated this agreement, has entered into and seized Venezuelan territory, navigated the Guiana, Morajuana, and Amacuro and Brazo-Barima Rivers; posted signs on the trees promulgating her laws, appointed policemen, kidnapped a Venezuelan officer on Venezuelan territory for the alleged ill-treatment of a Portuguese; imprisoned him at Georgetown, and condemned him to pay a fine of £20. She has established in Amacuro public offices. She keeps the sloop *Transfer* guarding the coast between Amacuro and Barima; has appointed judges to decide on criminal and civil cases; has authorized the working of mines in Venezuelan territory and is appropriating whatever she pleases on the pretended grounds of an undecided boundary line.

In the year 1858 the discovery of the gold mines of Caratel attracted great numbers of natives and foreigners ; and English experts and scientists also arrived at the place, all of which excited the colony of Demerara, the desire to open a direct communication with the gold regions. The Government of Venezuela opposed entrance into these regions except through the regular ports of entry, and refused its consent to the opening of any road leading thereto. In 1844 and 1850 the British Government, through its Minister in Caracas Sir Bedford Clinton Wilson, declared that Great Britain would not occupy the territory in question, and Venezuela has never understood nor shall she ever admit that Barima Point should have been in dispute, or Barima Island either, and the propositions of Lord Aberdeen, Lord Granville and Lord Roseberry, as may be seen, never included Barima Island. The dispute was not over the lands comprised between the Pomaron and Amacuro Rivers but those between the Pomaron and Esequibo. Never losing sight of the question, Venezuela urged a settlement in 1876. After the expiration of five years, September 1881, Lord Granville presented a new demarkation line, beginning at a point on the sea-coast, at a longitude of twenty-nine to the east of the right bank of the Barima River. He added that by so doing he satisfied the reasonable claims of Venezuela, and ceded to her the so-called Dardanelles of the Orinoco, and the most complete dominion of its mouth. The Venezuelan Government did not accept this line either, which for well-known reasons, is still more damaging to the Venezuelan nation than that of Lord Aberdeen. In 1883, the British Government joined together the three questions of boundaries, an additional duty of 30 per cent. on merchandise coming from the West Indies and pecuniary claims. In 1883 the Venezuelan Government made the contract of Manoa in which it granted to Mr. Fitzgerald the working of the territorial wealth of that section of the country up to the boundaries of British Guiana. Hence the pretext of the English Government to state, through its representative in Caracas, in its note of January 8, 1885, to the Venezuelan Government that the Government of Her British Majesty, under the date of November, 1884, informed him that he should call the at-

tention of the Government of Venezuela to the proceedings of the Manoa Company in which Her British Majesty's Government as well as that of Venezuela had claims, and he added that Lord Granville sent him instructions to request the Venezuelan officials to act in the matter of prohibiting the said company from taking possession of any part of the territory claimed by the British Government, and that the latter Government, in the event of Venezuela refusing to act upon the matter would to its regret adopt strong measures against the usurpation of the Manoa Company, and that the Government of British Guiana had been authorized to adopt those measures which would prevent such usurpation and preserve the peace. The Venezuelan Government answered the British Minister, Mr. Mansfield, that in accordance with the terms of the contract, up to the boundaries of British Guiana, the said boundaries only reached as far as the limits under discussion, and promised to satisfactorily explain all the acts which had already been attributed to the Manoa Company regarding its alleged trespass within the limits mentioned.

Previous to this state of affairs some officers of the British navy and civil authorities of Great Britain had exercised their jurisdiction in the great mouth of the Orinoco River and elsewhere, without any regard to the sovereignty laws, and authority of Venezuela. In 1884, the British authorities asked for pilots in order to go up the Orinoco River. This request was denied inasmuch as they were not bound for any regular port of entry yet they proceeded on their trip and penetrated territory which had exclusively belonged to the Republic of Venezuela, and there placed marks and notices stating that the British laws were in force in said regions. They changed the Venezuelan officers and promised to return with stronger force in order to make effective this territorial usurpation. They returned as promised and never paid any attention to the protests of the Venezuelan authorities, and even took prisoner a Venezuelan Commissioner, Mr. Robert Wells, under the pretext that he had committed a certain offense and he was placed on trial in Demerara, and punished as already

mentioned. The Venezuelan Government sent a commissioner to investigate the facts and he found in Morajuaana, a certain Mr. Michael McTurk with whom he conversed and exchanged notes. This individual whose title is that of special magistrate pro tem and superintendent of Crown Lands and the forest in the district of the Pomaron River, answered in the following terms :

I have been on the rivers Amacuro, Barima, Morajuaana, and Wani and placed notices in English at the principal points on said rivers. I regret that I have not a copy of these notices to send you, but as they were removed by the employees of the Manoa Company, you may probably be able to get one from them. The notices were posted once only by order of his Excellency the Governor of British Guiana. It is proved beyond dispute that the British Government has violated the agreement entered into with Venezuela respecting the declaration that the British Government would neither occupy nor usurp any part of the territory under discussion. This happened in 1884, and the British officials began their invasions and encroachments upon the Venezuelan territory without even giving any notice through their legation at Caracas, nor stating to the Government of Venezuela the reasons they had to commit such invasions. On the 8th of January, 1885, the British Minister in Caracas, Mr. Mansfield, informed the Venezuelan Government that the Governor of British Guiana would not take any action, pending the application sent to the Venezuelan Government to restrain the employees of the Manoa Company from claiming or occupying any part of the territory claimed by Great Britain. A few days later he said Mr. Mansfield, in his note of January 24, 1885, informed the Venezuelan Government that since October 18, 1884, the Governor of British Guiana had ordered posts to be placed on the eastern shore of the Amacuro River and elsewhere. On January 25, 1885, Mr. Mansfield also informed the Venezuelan Government that the Governor of British Guiana had sent a police detachment and a magistrate to investigate the proceedings of the Manoa Company on the eastern shore of the Amacuro River. The Venezuelan Government in its answer to Mr. Mansfield

stated that it had a Plenipotentiary Minister in London for the purpose of ending that long controversy of limits and that at the instance of the British Foreign Minister, Mr. Wilson, he had requested : First. The removal of all the posts and notices establishing the sovereignty of England in the disputed territory. Second. The withdrawal of all officers and the police force which had been stationed in the places in question. Third. A satisfactory explanation of the violation of the agreement. Fourth. The annulment of the proceedings against Mr. Wells. Fifth. The complete re-establishment of the state of things as in 1850.

The complaints of Venezuela were unheeded by the British Government, and were not even politely answered. In 1886 Lord Roseberry asked for a boundary line, starting from the coast as far as the River Guiana. In 1868 the Governor of Demerara in a decree concerning in the division of registry did not define the boundary, but only up to the northern line with the Pomaron River. It was not till 1886, when by order of the British Government, he established new demarkations which reached to the eastern shore of the Amacuro River, which flows into the Orinoco River. The Venezuelan Minister in London had already begun negotiations with the British Government in 1884. The English Minister, Mr. Mansfield, informed the Venezuelan Government that, under the date of February 29th, Lord Granville stated that Her British Majesty's Government did not think that the question of limits ought to be submitted to a court of arbitration, and insisted in this matter, notwithstanding the protests of the Venezuelan Minister of Foreign Affairs, who set forth,—that Venezuela could not admit any other boundaries but those which she possessed in 1810. Besides, reference was then made to the proposition submitted by Lord Aberdeen in July, 1843, in regard to arbitration. Further more, when on the occasion of the Treaty of Paris, in 1856, Great Britain through her minister at Caracas asked the Venezuelan Government to avail itself of the good offices of a friendly nation, in order to avoid international complications, Venezuela gladly assented, with the understanding that such suggestion involved the principle of arbitration. The Vene-

zuelan Minister of Foreign Affairs also stated then that the Prime Minister of Great Britain once expressed himself in the following terms : “ As for the proposition to submit international misunderstandings to arbitration, I think it is in itself a great triumph.” This is, perhaps, the first time that the representatives of the principle nations of Europe have given an emphatical expression to feelings which at least contain a limited disapproval of the resort to war, and has vindicated the supremacy of reason, justice, humanity, and religion. This referred to the spirit which prevailed at the aforesaid Conference of Paris in 1856. The proposition of Mr. Richards to recommend Her Majesty to instruct the Secretary of Foreign Affairs to put himself in communication with other powers in order to improve International Law, and to establish a general and permanent system of arbitration between nations, was approved in 1873 by a majority of 98 votes against 88 votes. It is affirmed, also, that Sir John Browning introduced the principle of arbitration into treaties which he negotiated with Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, and Hanover. The Venezuelan Minister of Foreign Affairs also recalled the practical instances in which Great Britain has adopted arbitration as a means to settle disputes : namely, the question of limits with the United States, submitted to the King of Holland in 1830, and in 1871 to the Emperor of Germany, and concluded by mentioning a more recent event, the arbitration clause introduced in the protocol annexed to the treaty between Great Britain and Italy in 1883, which met with the general applause of the Association of International Arbitration of England in an address signed by eight members of the House of Lords, by forty-five of the House of Commons, and by professors of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London, as well as by magistrates, merchants, and prominent persons in the United Kingdom. The British Minister duly transmitted the note of the Venezuelan Government above referred to, to his government, and under date of August 6, 1884, declared that Lord Granville instructed him to state that Her Majesty’s Government adhered to their opinion that arbitration is not a desirable, or, indeed, a suitable mode of

dealing with the long standing question of limits. The Minister Plenipotentiary of Venezuela in London still endeavored to bring the matter to an amicable and equitable solution, and having exchanged with the British Minister of Foreign Affairs several drafts of treaties, came to the final conclusion of making a treaty between the two nations in which it was agreed to insert the clause of arbitration in order to submit all controversies and misunderstandings between the high contracting parties to that principle. Everything was nearly ready for the signing of this contract, when a change took place in the British Ministry, and Lord Salisbury came into power in June, 1884. His Lordship refused to acknowledge the acts of his predecessors concerning the proposed treaty with Venezuela, notwithstanding that the Venezuelan Minister in London transmitted to Lord Salisbury a copy of the note of the Earl of Granville, in which he stated, under the 25th of May, to the Venezuelan Minister that "Her Majesty's Government agree to the substitution of the phrase 'Power' to be chosen by the high contracting parties, instead of 'Arbitration' in the article respecting arbitration, and that they further agree that the undertaking to refer differences to arbitration shall include all differences which may occur between the high contracting parties, and not those only which should arise from the interpretation of the treaty." The Venezuelan Minister also referred to the utterances of Lord Salisbury, British Minister of Foreign Affairs, when he stated the policy of the new government in his speech of June 6, 1884, in the following terms:

"It is not our business to enter on controversial questions which may formerly have been raised. And still more, your Lordships will observe the very material restriction on our action and on our statements, which arises from the fact that we have come into these matters, right in the middle of them, and we are finishing or furnishing the end of that which others have begun. The consequence of that is, that many pledges have been given, and the first duty of any Government, whether it is now or has lasted for a considerable length of time, or from whatever side of the house or party it is drawn, is to see that the pledges which the English Gov-

ernment has given shall be observed." Reference was also made to the fact that Majesty's Government have adopted arbitration for questions about territory as the happiest solution with the United States of America in which two territorial disputes were referred respectively to the King of the Netherlands and to the Emperor of Germany. Venezuela has sought the intercession of the United States towards requesting the British Government, in view of its established principles of arbitration and its former propositions made to Venezuela, to submit the question of limits between Venezuela and British Guiana to an arbitration settlement. Spain offered her good services, but England refused them, as well as those of the United States. The Venezuelan Government has kept a voluminous correspondence regarding the subject, and the Cabinet at Washington has submitted it to the American International Conference.

The control of the mouth of the Orinoco must of necessity belong to Venezuela, and the greatest of all Americans interests are now depending on the issue of this great question of the limits of the Republic of Venezuela and Great Britain, since English control of the Orinoco River would be tantamount to the control of all trade which can be carried on British vessels on the second of South America's greatest waterways; and hence a prompt and energetic solution of this controversy cannot be overestimated by the American people.

Intimately connected with the question is another of supreme importance to the people of the United States. We are already reaching out for the trade of Central and South America. With this object in view a conference of American nations was recently held in Washington, and the project of an intercontinental railroad is already on hand to bind the American Republics in a closer union. But if foreign powers are to be allowed to annex South American territory at will, and seize on the gateways of the South American continent, the late conference was but a solemn farce, and the Monroe Doctrine a delusion. The foreign trade of Central and South America amounts to the enormous sum of \$850,000,000 yearly. Of this \$420,000,000 consists of merchandise imported from

the United States and Europe. And of this total trade the United States has secured only \$130,000,000, and of this \$40,000,000 represents exports from the United States, and the figures are far below the present estimate of the South American trade. Considering our great manufacturing facilities and mechanical ingenuity, and proximity to those countries, it should be our policy and purpose to secure the vast bulk of this trade, now monopolized by England, France, and Germany. But it cannot be done by any stand and wait policy ; but by a positive and, if need be, an aggressive one. Again and still more important is the fact that a new waterway will in a few years be opened across the isthmus. That waterway will be in the language of a Republican President in his message to Congress "a part of the coast-line of the United States." That part of our coast-line, England will endeavor to control. Already the London "Times" tells us that the position of a Great Britain in regard to the canal is 'impregnable,' and that it is England's duty to preserve the freedom of international trade. Her position in the West Indies and British Honduras, which she turned into a colony in violation of the Clayton Bulwer treaty as Mr. Blaine so conclusively showed in his contention with Lord Granville, gives her a point of vantage in those regions that we do not possess. Do we intend to strengthen her hand, and give color to her pretensions now by permitting her to carry on her Asiatic methods of land grabbing in South America and making the Orinoco a British River ? The political and commercial value of the canal was clearly understood and expressed nearly two hundred years ago by Patterson who wrote : "The time and expense of navigation to China, Japan, and the Spice Island, and the greater part of the East Indies will be lessened more than one half, and the consumption of European commodities and manufactures will be more than doubled and again, 'thus this door of the seas and key of the universe with anything of a reasonable management will of course enable its proprietors to give laws to both oceans and become arbitrators of the world.'" A report made some years ago to the Secretary of the United States Navy stated that the construction of the canal would save the following

distances over the cape route : from New York to Shanghai, 11,600 miles ; to Valparaiso, 8,100 ; to Calao, 10,000 ; to San Francisco, 14,000 ; to Canton, 10,900 ; to Calcutta, 9,600. It will also proportionately shorten the way from Australia, New Zealand, and other countries. It is of course the United States and the other Republics on the Pacific seaboard of Central and South America that would be most profited by the canal. Besides this great volume of traffic with foreign countries the United States would greatly profit by having communication with our own Pacific States via the canal. Next to the United States the canal is of the greatest importance to Great Britain. She would use it for practically all her trade with our Pacific States, her commerce with which is now represented by a tonnage of more than 700,000 tons a year, and a value of £9,000,000 sterling. It would be used for one half of her trade with Mexico, representing a declared value of £2,500,000 and the trade of Peru and Chili yielding nearly 600,000 tons of shipping and officially valued at £9,600,000 sterling per annum. But this would not be the chief advantage to Great Britain. The many unsettled problems that still surround the Suez Canal administration make it advantageous to England to possess another alternative route to her Australian Colonies and the Chinese Empire. Owing to the congestion of traffic and the heavy dues amounting in the Indian transport to about 40 per cent. of the total freight, not much more than 56 per cent. of England's total imports from Asia and the Australian Colonies, and not more than 70 per cent. of her exports to those countries pass through the Suez Canal. The remainder are taken by the Cape route. The present value of her trade with the Australian Colonies alone, imports and exports, is over £550,000,000 sterling per annum. And the trade will always be a vastly increasing one. It will be readily seen how deeply England's interests are involved in controlling, or preventing our control of the canal.

Those people who object to our having a foreign policy forget that it is not a foreign policy to take the measures necessary to secure our home interests. Besides, the United States is destined to become the great commercial nation of the fu-

ture and to monopolize all the commerce of the western world to exclusion of Great Britain or any other power. But this condition will not be easily attained unless the "Monroe Doctrine" is to be something more than a tradition. Our Washington statesmen have been too long pursuing a mere negative policy instead of laying broad and deep the foundations of American supremacy, commercial as well as political in this half of the world, and securing the place that our position entitles us to in the commerce of nations as outlined recently by our able and far-seeing Secretary of State, the Hon. James G. Blaine, and fully indorsed by President Harrison.

To do this the United States need not enter upon any new or aggressive policy. It has only to say "hands off" to any nation that attempts to assert its dominion within the commercial or political orbit of the United States. This has hitherto been with us an unvarying policy, and has always been upheld by the people. We caused the withdrawal of the French from Mexico, and so put an end to Maximilian's Empire; we asserted our rights regarding the Sandwich Islands and Samoa, and we intimated that no foreign power must possess Cuba, in the event of Spain parting with that island. How then, in the face of this traditional policy, a policy sustained by our ablest statesmen and public opinion, can we remain indifferent to England's spoliation of our sister republic of Venezuela, which if permitted to be carried out, will be used as a leverage against our vital interests, as already intimated. It is an erroneous supposition that the "Monroe Doctrine" is asserted by the United States alone. It has already been appealed to on various occasions, as by Venezuela recently in relation to the present difficulties. But, perhaps, the strongest and most significant declaration in relation to the "Monroe Doctrine" since it was first enunciated by its author, and on the mutual relations of the American Republics, was that made a few months ago by the President of the Republic of Brazil, on receiving the credentials of the United States Minister. In addressing President de Fonseca, Minister Conger said that he bore to Brazil assurances of the most cordial sympathy and co-operation in all laudable move-

ments that would tend to increase the friendly relations existing between the two Governments, and that would give future promise of mutual good. In his reply, the President said among other things: "Although we are the last to enter into the communion of republics which, beginning with the glorious Declaration of your Independence, has given to the world a lesson of liberty and human progress, you will find us henceforward among the first in the line of defense of the republican institutions which bless our hemisphere, as your collaborators in the work of American civilization, peace and happiness. It was still in the time of the monarchy that an illustrious savant, your compatriot, said in this capital that there were no more two Americas. To-day, with greater truth, I can affirm that all the states of America find themselves united by the fraternity of their institutions and by the identity of their destinies. To the sentiment of an independent country, enjoyed by each citizen of the Republic which extends from the ice of your northern lakes to the mountains of our neighbors of the south between which throbs the Brazilian heart with pulsations of patriotism, is united the sentiment of a great American fatherland, the most lofty symbol of the fraternity of free people united by a common ideal. This hope then, which you cherish, is not merely a hope, Mr. Minister, it is a happy reality. We are more than neighbors in spite of the distance which separates us; we are brothers, and if the conditions of chance or the laws of history have made your country and Brazil the greatest republics of America, in territory and population, the greater the duty incumbent on us to give to each other the hand in the future defense of our rights and those of the sister nations." This is direct and plain intimation that the United States of Brazil, as well as the United States of America, binds itself as a government to the "Monroe Doctrine." But President Fonseca goes further than President Monroe. The latter intended that the United States should not permit any foreign power to extend its dominion over this hemisphere." But President Fonseca outlines a closer interest on our part in the American nations, inasmuch as they declare they are only a part of "a great American fatherland,

extending from the lakes to Cape Horn." He outlined a great confederation of republics, embracing the entire continent, North and South, bound together by mutual interest, political and commercial, each supreme within its own dominion, but morally bound to the defense and preservation of the rights and liberties of its neighbors.

That the Panama Canal will be completed within the next decade is more than probable. According to the agreement entered into between the Columbian Republic and the French Company, the work must be resumed by 1893, else the contract will be void and the Republic will enter into full possession and ownership of the work, plant, and property. In the latter event, the Panama Canal will then be in the market for competitive bids for the completion of the work. American capital will not be forthcoming, as it will be absorbed in the Nicaragua enterprise.

Nor is it likely that the French will risk \$100,000,000 in addition to the \$250,000,000 in that recklessly mismanaged affair. It will in all likelihood be built by English capital, and then what will prevent the British Government to buy up the shares, as in the case of the Suez Canal? With the internal waterways of South America in her possession and the Panama Canal under her control, she will have Venezuela and Columbia wedged in as in a vise, and so can hold the commercial interests of the entire Southern Continent within her grasp. In 1885, we landed our troops on the isthmus to protect American interests. And only a short time ago we brought our force to bear in the Haytian revolution, for a similar purpose. We have recently maintained our rights in regard to the Canadian fisheries, and the Behring Sea question, in the face of England; yet these questions were insignificant as compared with the momentous interests of the United States in South America. The cry of entangling alliances has no relation to the issues in question. The defense of our own interests involves no alliances, but the neglect of them would involve a criminal supineness. Besides, this is a policy which will command the approval of the entire American people. Secretary Bayard took as strong a position on the Venezuelan difficulty as did his predecessors,

Evarts and Frelinghuysen, or his successor, Secretary Blaine. Nothing could more plainly show the brutal designs of England than the answer made a short time ago to the Venezuelan Envoy, Dr. Pulido, who was sent to obtain an equitable and satisfactory settlement of the boundary dispute. Lord Salisbury, in violation of his own declaration that he would abide by the engagements entered into by the preceeding government, refused to submit the question to arbitration, excepting on the preposterous grounds of ceding all the Venezuelan territory that Great Britain has seized. In that case he would arbitrate concerning a large extent of territory to which the British hitherto never laid claim, but which, by way of a threat, they have now undertaken to survey.

In any case it is the duty of the United States Government to protect our own interests so seriously threatened in the matter, as well as to prevent the spoilation of a sister Republic on this continent. The relations of Venezuela and Great Britain are now strained to the snapping point.

Already collisions have been reported between bodies of Venezuelan and British troops, and an enlargement of the forces on both sides. Under these circumstances, President Anduesa Palacio, of Venezuela, has again appealed to the United States Government to uphold the rights of that republic, and to prevent the seizure of its territory. The American people and press are almost unanimously in favor of applying the "Monroe Doctrine" in its strictest sense, especially where Great Britain is the offender. The only opponents of this policy are the Mugwump and Anglo-American journals, which happily have neither influence nor a numerous following. The principal objections alleged against the interposition of our Government in the matter are, that the boundary dispute involves questions that are very complicated, and that the belligerent attitude of the two disputants is unfavorable to the maintainance of peace between them. There are no complicated questions involved in the matter, as we shall abundantly show ; and, as to the belligerency manifested by the parties at issue, it is only the belligerency of the pirate, the burglar, and the bully on the one side, and the natural and legitimate resistance of the victim on the other.

But it is difficult to reconcile the allegation of these journals that Venezuela wants flight, while admitting at the same time that she is willing and anxious to have the difficulty settled by arbitration.

Again we are told that Venezuela has boundary disputes with Brazil and Columbia, and that we cannot support Venezuela in all of them. To which we answer, "Nobody has asked us." But these three republics agreed at the late Pan-American Conference in Washington to settle all their boundary disputes by arbitration, and it will be time enough for us to complain when they show that their agreement to that principle was not made in good faith. The argument that Venezuela is frequently afflicted with internal commotions and revolts, and that, therefore, it is better to avoid all unnecessary dealings with any government that may be in power there, is scarce worthy of reference. As well say that because a family have frequent quarrels, that the police should not interfere if they saw burglars enter their house, to rob and murder them. We are also informed that Secretary Blaine has promised the Venezuelan Government the strongest possible moral support of the United States in the matter. But something more substantial than moral support is required where American interests and American rights are assailed. The difficulty should be settled by arbitration or by the direct interference of the United States Government in support of the rights of Venezuela. We did not continue our efforts to moral force in our two wars with Great Britain, nor was it moral force that compelled her to yield to arbitration on the San Juan question, the Alabama claims, the Behring Sea embroglio, and other instances. It was the knowledge that she would otherwise have to encounter the physical power of the United States, that caused her to yield. It may be objected that these causes concerned ourselves directly. But this Venezuelan affair concerns us also, and if only indirectly, none the less materially. We would not allow England to seize the Sandwich Islands, much as she desires to do so, and we have refused to acknowledge her claims in Central America, founded our usurpation and we are to look on with indifference at the spoliation of a republic of far more importance

to us in a commercial and political sense ? Would we permit England to-day to seize Hayti, or San Domingo, or Cuba, if the latter were a free republic ? Certainly not. Then why allow her to dismember a republic, that possesses the second greatest waterway of South America ? Why should we drive the French out of Mexico, and let the English into Venezuela ? We do not desire to interfere with Great Britain in Guiana, if she keeps her own side of the boundary line, and abstains from transferring her Asiatic methods of land-grabbing to this Western hemisphere. And I confidently assert that no administration or party that permits any European power in violation of the Monroe Doctrine to seize the dominions of any of our sister republics can appeal with success for the support of the American people. The party that would permit such an outrage would be compelled to efface itself like the old Whigs, and to reorganize on an American basis. No party fealty can be counted on where American interests are sacrificed. * We are the national protectors of the territorial integrity of the whole of this western world, and we propose in conjunction with our sister republics to monopolize its commerce to the exclusion of foreign nations and to protect its liberty against all attack. But even if the Government should not move in the matter, the United States would furnish plenty of volunteers to swell the armies of Venezuela. We need violate no neutrality law or do aught inconsistent with our duties as citizens of this republic. What is to hinder thousands of Americans and veteran officers of our civil war to go down to Venezuela as mere lookers-on in case of hostilities between that republic and Great Britain ? And, if after their arrival they should not continue long in the capacity of spectators, whose business would it be save their own ? England, it is said, threatens to bombard the coast cities of Venezuela. She will hesitate before doing so. If she starts in to bombard American cities, she will run the risk of kindling a flame that may efface her commerce from the seas, and even envelope her in her tight little island. She will not be allowed to tumble down South American cities, because their inhabitants will not yield to her stand-and-deliver policy with the impunity she has experienced in Japan, China, and Egypt. †

I trust that both of the great parties will next year reiterate in their platforms their purpose to uphold the Monroe Doctrine in its strictest application, and if so, I also trust that whichever party may rule at Washington for the next four years will use every legitimate means to extend our commercial relations with the South American Republics—Venezuela among the first of them—and will have the consistency to defend our interests in those countries, which cannot be done without at the same time, defending those countries from foreign encroachments or attack.

At the conclusion of Mr. Rooney's address the audience arose and gave three hearty cheers for the Republic of Venezuela, and the Monroe Doctrine.

End.

G. L. C. T.
 1. INDEPENDENT
 17
 1. 1917
 1. 1917
 1. 1917
 1. 1917

